

ABSTRACT

CONSISTENCY OF TEACHERS' RATINGS OF PUPILS' BEHAVIORS IN CLASSROOM SETTINGS

By

Edith E. Gordon

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to investigate the consistency of ratings reported on pupils by several teachers describing their behavior in the classrooms. Using a behavior checklist, the researcher attempted to determine the value of information gathered from classroom teachers on the nature of misbehavior in the classroom.

Methods and Procedures

The sample was one hundred twenty-seven seventh grade white boys enrolled in regular classes fifty-five minutes per day for one school year. Each pupil was rated by four of his teachers on a behavior checklist emphasizing disruptive behavior in the classroom.

A behavior checklist for each pupil was given to the raters with the names of the pupils taught by the rater written across the top of each checklist.

Description of Instrument

The behavior checklist consisted of thirty-five short descriptive statements of behaviors that frequently occur in classrooms. Seven categories of behavior were included. The categories were mobility, noise, disturbs others' property, aggression-mistreats others (peers), aggression-mistreats adults (teachers and teacher aids), general verbal and non-verbal behavior. The Likert Technique was used to assign numerical values to ratings as follows:

- | | |
|------------------|-----|
| 1. Almost always | = 5 |
| 2. Often | = 4 |
| 3. Sometimes | = 3 |
| 4. Seldom | = 2 |
| 5. Never | = 1 |

Descriptions of disruptive classroom behaviors were obtained from many teachers. These provided the basis of the categories of behavior used in this checklist. Five statements for each category were included.

A pilot study was conducted to check out the instrument.

Findings

Coefficients obtained were computed by using Horst's interjudge reliability correlation coefficient formula. The correlation coefficients were statistically significant in all three groups.

A category of items that described reticent, unresponsive, and non-involvement behavior gave lower interjudge reliability coefficients and should be used with caution on a behavior checklist.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were reached from the findings of this study;

1. The main findings indicated that teachers as raters of students' behavior in the classroom were reliable and that they were consistent.
2. The ratings within the groups were found to be consistent as well as between the groups.
3. This implied that the observable behavior described on the behavior checklist was stable from classroom to classroom and the teachers were rating the general classroom behavior of students.
4. Behavior checklists appear to be an effective way of magnifying disruptive classroom behavior and provide the counselor with descriptive data from several sources.

CONSISTENCY OF TEACHERS' RATINGS OF PUPILS' BEHAVIORS
IN CLASSROOM SETTINGS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

BY
EDITH E. GORDON

ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
MAY 1978

R = IV T = 66

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	iii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Sociological Rationale	2
Definition of Terms	3
Evolution of the Problem	4
Contribution to Educational Knowledge	6
Statement of the Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	6
Design of the Pilot Study	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Developing a Behavior Checklist	9
Selection of Raters	10
Rater Biases	11
Discriminability as Related to Length of Behavior Checklist	14
Summary of Related Literature	16
III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
Summary of Findings	18
Conclusions	19
Implications	19
Recommendations	20
Implications for Future Study	22
APPENDIX A	23
Table 2 - Pilot Study - Raw Data - 32 Subjects - 5 Raters	
APPENDIX B	31
Table 3 - Group I - Raw Data - 40 Subjects - 4 Raters	
APPENDIX C	41
Table 4 - Group II - Raw Data - 47 Subjects - 4 Raters	

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

	Page
APPENDIX D	52
Table 5 - Group III - Raw Data - 37 Subjects - 5 Raters	
APPENDIX E	63
Behavior Checklist	
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	65

LIST OF TABLES

1. Interjudge Reliability Coefficients for Each Group of Students	21
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is very grateful to many persons who encouraged and assisted her in the completion of this project.

Dr. Eleanor Callon, her major advisor, who gave her considerable help, encouragement, and confidence, kept her working on the project. She would also like to express her appreciation to the other members of the Department of Psychological Services who listened to her proposal and offered valuable suggestions.

The writer is also grateful to Mr. E. J. Chism, principal of Marietta Junior High School, who allowed her to gather data on the seventh grade boys (1975-76) used in this project. The seventh grade teachers at Marietta Junior High, who rated students and gave her encouraging feedback on the value of a behavior checklist, helped to make this study possible.

The writer also offers special thanks to members of her family, who encouraged her to attempt this goal, and have expressed confidence in her ability to complete this study.

Her parents gave generously of their love, financial assistance, encouragement, and understanding which made the study a worthwhile academic experience.

Edith E. Gordon

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The need for an objective evaluation of behavior, exhibited in the classroom by junior high students, has become increasingly important. It is the writer's opinion that social adjustment is a necessity for each student to have a positive school experience. Teachers, counselors, and psychologists need objective information to evaluate the student's behavior for appropriate diagnosis and referral for remediation for the student.

Presently, behavior checklists, rating scales, and questionnaires are widely used to gather data on the classroom behavior of students. Although the student is often referred to the counselor or psychologist for help with behavior problems, the counselor must be concerned with the type of information being obtained from the classroom teacher. The researcher sought answers to specific questions. How valid is the information of the referring teacher? Does the student exhibit this behavior in other classrooms? Can common descriptive words be used by teachers and counselors to consistently describe disruptive behavior in the classroom?

According to the writer's experience as a counselor, a clear need exists for the development of an adequate, and objective behavior checklist for junior high school students. However, information gathered by this method should be valid and easily interpreted.

The present study was made to establish a little more measurable confidence that can be accorded information received from classroom teachers about students' behaviors.

Sociological Rationale

The middle school counselor is responsible for obtaining information about students in the classroom setting. Sociological implications are often masked by the teacher's report to the counselor. However, counselors are constantly asked, by teachers, to counsel students who exhibit various types of deviant behavior in the classroom.

A sociological rationale directs one's attention to the social development of the student, rather than the psychological development. Psychological facts appear to dominate traditional guidance thinking simply because the tools of psychology are readily available and used by counselors. The educational background of most trained counselors is saturated with psychology and other related courses. Using a sociological approach will allow the researcher to objectively gather information on the student's classroom behavior. This information can then be used to help the student reduce the frequency of or eliminate the disruptive behavior. This does not mean institutionalized control although counselors often find themselves involved in the mechanics of this task.

The sociological approach takes into consideration that one must translate social disorganization into some observable form.¹ This

¹Nicholas J. Long, William C. Morse, and Ruth G. Newman, Conflict in the Classroom (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971), pp. 149-150.

research addressed only one aspect of social disorganization, overt disruptive behavior, in the classroom setting.

There are many factors which contribute to overt disruptive behavior that are observable and can be rated; for example, social disorganization in the home, community, and in the lives of significant others in the student's life. How do these factors influence the student's behavior? Counselors and teachers acknowledge that school is but one environment among many that shapes the attitudes, reactions, and adaptations of students. The school constitutes a highly complex set of environments. The importance of translating social disorganization into some observable form becomes a necessity and more helpful when counselors attempt to do intervention counseling with students referred for help. Such statements as: "Wade is too aggressive." "He constantly disturbs others." "He abuses others physically or verbally." "He is too noisy." "He is hyperactive." "He refuses to attend to his task and pay attention." These kinds of behavior call for explanations. What do these statements really mean in terms of observable behaviors? By using a sociological approach, the researcher was able to investigate, on a scientific level, disruptive behavior exhibited in the classroom.¹

Definition of Terms

The following terms had the following definitions in this study:

1. Behavior Checklist - is a researcher's designed list of short descriptions of the way a student expresses himself.
2. Classroom - is a place where a group of students meets to obtain instructions from a teacher and engage in learning activities, interactions with the teacher and classmates.

¹ Herman J. Peters and Gail F. Farwell, Guidance: A Developmental Approach (Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally and Company, 1967), pp. 359-360.

3. Consistency - is the degree of common agreement between ratings of described behavior given by several raters,
4. Disruptive Behavior - is a student's action that impedes the learning process in the classroom.
5. Inconsistency - is disagreement between raters' ratings of a described phenomenon.
6. Social disorganization - a state of society characterized by the breakdown of effective social control resulting in a lack of functional integration between groups, conflicting social attitudes, and personal maladjustments.¹

Evolution of the Problem

Counselors are constantly asked to counsel students who present behavior problems in classrooms. However, the counselor is placed in an awkward position when receiving information about a student's behavior from the classroom teacher. It is important for the counselor to determine if the information reported stems from a chronic problem exhibited by the student in several classes or just the reporting teacher's class and if the disruptive behavior is similarly described and viewed by other teachers.

A critical review of the literature reveals that only a few studies have been done, using subjects from 12 to 13 years old, and using a behavior checklist as the tool for gathering information in a particular setting. Ross, Lacey, and Parton developed the Pittsburgh Adjustment Survey Scales to evaluate the social behavior of elementary school-age boys using the observations of classroom teachers.² A total of

¹Peters and Farwell, Guidance: A Developmental Approach, pp. 359-360.

²Alan O. Ross, Harvey M. Lacey, and David A. Parton, "The Development of A Behavior Checklist for Boys," Child Development 35 (May — August 1959): 1013-1027.

202 boys, distributed nearly equally over grades 1-6, was selected by the principal to be rated by the homeroom teachers who had no knowledge as to how they were selected.

Cattell and Coan's research, with six-to-eight year old children, supports the belief that, to avoid the "limiting factor" of peer group raters and the "affectional biases" of parents, one must rely on the teacher's rating in whose class the child is situated.¹

Quay and Quay's study, with children ranging in age from five to nineteen years, states that, ". . . it appears that at least the general outlines of the personality and conduct factor are ubiquitous when studied."² They, too, feel that noticeable variables may vary due to developmental changes, but the basic conceptual nature of the factors remains constant. It, also, may be that, at about ages 12-14, the personality dimension is subdivided so that a cluster of problem behaviors, which seems related to immaturity, or regression, appears as characteristics unique to this age group and subject to change as the age level changes. Therefore, the development of a behavior checklist, for seventh graders in this setting, was a necessity.

The researcher feels a great need to determine whether a behavior checklist is an appropriate tool for gathering data on the middle school age student. Thinking about this need for over a year and faced with the problem, an attempt was made to explore the use of a behavioral checklist as a useful tool.

¹Raymond B. Cattell and Richard W. Coan, "Child Personality Structure as Revealed in Teachers' Behavior Ratings," Journal of Clinical Psychology 13 (May 1959): 315-327.

²Herbert C. Quay and Lorence C. Quay, "Behavior Problems in Early Adolescence," Child Development 36 (March 1965): 215-220.

Contribution to Educational Knowledge

The researcher attempted to develop a behavioral checklist that may be useful and helpful in gathering data on disruptive classroom behaviors perceived by teachers. If the null hypothesis: "There is no consistency between teacher ratings of pupil behavior in classroom settings," is accepted, the need for an effective way of gathering information on classroom behavior will be supported. If the null hypothesis is rejected, the behavioral checklist will be considered another way of assessing classroom behavior in rateable form. The behavioral checklist presents information in a clear, and rateable form which provides a quick look at what teachers consider disruptive behavior for seventh grade boys.

Statement of the Problem

This study was made to determine the consistency of teachers' ratings of items describing observable student behavior in the classroom settings.

Purpose of the Study

This study was made to achieve the purposes listed below:

1. To test the hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between a selected group of teachers' ratings of disruptive classroom behavior of a selected group of seventh-grade white male students attending Marietta Junior High School.
2. To determine the consistency in a selected group of teachers' responses to descriptive statements of classroom behavior of a selected group of seventh-grade white male students attending Marietta Junior High School.
3. To determine whether this checklist could be used by these teachers to consistently rate disruptive classroom behavior of seventh grade male raters.

4. To assess the kinds of disruptive classroom behaviors seventh grade male students were displaying in their classes,
5. To assess classroom teachers' awareness of disruptive classroom behaviors their seventh-grade male white students were exhibiting,

Design of the Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted on thirty-two white American male students enrolled in the seventh grade at Marietta Junior High School. The raters were five seventh grade teachers, one male and four females. Ratings were made at the end of the school year on each student. Horst's interjudge reliability coefficient formula was used to compute the interjudge reliability coefficients on the behavior checklist.¹

The formula is:

$$r = 1 - \frac{\sum \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i - 1}}{\sigma_M^2}$$

N represents the number of subjects; n_i the number of measures for subject i , σ_i , the standard deviation of these measures for subject i ; σ_M the standard deviation of the means for N persons; and r , the estimate of the reliability of means.

Categories I and III had lower coefficients than II, IV, VI, and VII. Category I had a coefficient of .78 and category III a coefficient of .50 when computed using the above formula. The interjudge reliability coefficients for the other categories were II = .95, IV = .98, V = .94, VI = .96, and VII = .97, respectively.

¹Paul Horst, "A Generalized Expression for the Reliability of Measures," *Psychometrika*, 14 (1949): 21-31. (Cited by Rowe 1970 "Humanistic Dimensions in Academic Achievement").

The researcher can only speculate about categories I and II; the items in these categories could have been too vague or did not cause the teachers to lose an undue amount of time from the regular classroom activities. The items were stated in such a way that one could easily overlook this behavior and feel that the student was very quiet, inattentive, dull or not interested in actively participating in class activities.

The categories of mobility, noise, disturbs others' property, aggression-mistreat others (peers), aggression-mistreat adults, and general verbal behavior had coefficients that were more consistent and reliable.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Developing A Behavior Checklist

Interest in developing a behavior checklist, to help counselors gather data on disruptive behavior exhibited by students in the classroom settings, necessitated a careful review of the literature on the use of behavior rating scales as useful tools.

Developing a behavior checklist that would reflect the reported maladaptive behavior, which intensified the researcher's concern, was the first priority. A review of the literature indicates that behavior checklists should be designed for the specific population under consideration. The Pittsburgh Adjustment Survey Scales (PASS) was developed to meet the need for objective evaluation of the social behavior of elementary school age boys, using the observations of classroom teachers as the basis of measurement.¹ Although teachers are more concerned with classroom management and teaching certain basic skills than with sociological influences on a student's behavior, teachers provide valid information on disruptive behavior. Teacher raters are usually interested, cooperative, and valuable assets in data gathering.

¹Ross, Lacey, and Parton, "The Development of A Behavior Checklist for Boys," pp. 1013-1027.

Selection of Raters

Teachers and nursery school observers are favored by Digman as raters of students' behaviors, primarily because they have sufficient opportunities to observe the characteristics they are asked to judge. He also states that the chief reasons for lack of trust in behavior ratings are, "(a) they often reflect numerous biases on the part of the raters and (b) there is widespread belief that ratings give little beyond general, overall impressions (halo effect)."¹ However, this can be overcome or greatly reduced by judging all subjects on the same scale at a predetermined time, and making certain the raters are well trained. With this in mind the raters, in the pilot study of this study, were instructed how to use the behavior checklist, what information was needed and how the information would be used.

Although Tolar, Scarpetti, and Lane found, through their research, that elementary teachers and clinical psychologists differed significantly in their ratings of the same students, this could have been influenced by training. Nevertheless, teachers were found to differ from psychologists in attitudes toward child behavior on a significant 22.4 per cent of the items, mostly falling in the categories of aggressive behavior, regressive behavior, and affect expression.² These findings support the statement that teachers are more concerned with classroom management and imparting information than with the psychological or sociological implications of a student's behavior.

¹John M. Digman, "Child Behavior Ratings: Further Evidence of A Multiple-Factor Model of Child Personality," Educational and Psychological Measurement 25 (August 1965): 787-799.

²Alexander Tolar, William L. Scarpetti and Paul A. Lane, "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children's Behavior Revisited," Journal of Educational Psychology 58 (June 1968): 175-180.

Tolar, Scarpetti, and Lane recognized that the appropriateness of behavior is age and situationally related. Cognizant of this fact, they deliberately employed a very broad range, with no anchoring points, to obtain information about the students they surveyed. Their intent was to ascertain what child behaviors the teachers and psychologists thought were normal or abnormal. They also noted that inexperienced teachers' ratings were inconsistent, especially on behaviors involving communication facility and efficiency.¹

Rater Biases

Considering another point of view on teacher raters, Feshbach calls our attention to teacher biases in rating students who exhibit different personality attributes.² Feshbach's results support the notion that teachers rate significantly more positive student's behaviors which exhibit certain personality traits.

Feshbach's hypothesis is, "Student teachers prefer children whose behaviors reflect control, caution, and conformity as opposed to children whose behaviors reflect independence, challenge, and flexibility."³ This difference may be reflected in their assigning more positive ratings or intellectual and social attributes to children manifesting more rigid, conforming, tidy, dependent, passive, acquiescent behaviors than to

¹Tolar, Scarpetti, and Lane, "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children's Behavior Revisited," pp. 175-180.

²Norma D. Feshbach, "Student Teacher Preferences for Elementary School Pupils Varying in Personality Characteristics," Journal of Educational Psychology 60 (April 1969): 126-39.

³Ibid.

children manifesting flexible, nonconforming, untidy, independent, active, and assertive behaviors.¹

Feshbach recognized the influence of sex-biased thinking and she describes it thusly:

Since some of these behaviors are sex typed, interactions are expected between the sex of the child and the personality triad being assessed; for example, while it is hypothesized that assertiveness and independence will receive less favored ratings when displayed by boys or girls, it should be even less acceptable in girls since these traits are less compatible with the female role.²

In Feshbach's study assessment of the teachers' behavior is not being made. However, it should be kept in mind, that the teachers' behavior does influence the students' reactions or behaviors. Also, teachers generally reward behaviors they prefer. The raters, (student teachers) in this study, probably felt insecure and anxious due to the newness of the experience and the pressure to do well in their student teaching assignments. One should not generalize to all teachers from this study. Experienced teacher raters may reflect more accepting, tolerant, and understanding attitudes of student's behaviors.

Behavior checklists were developed by Cattell and Coan³ and by Miller⁴ which included scales of low need achievement, aggression and

¹Feshbach, "Student Teacher Preferences for Elementary School Pupils Varying in Personality Characteristics," pp. 126-139.

²Ibid.

³Cattell and Coan, "Child Personality Structure as Revealed in Teachers' Behavior Ratings, pp. 315-327.

⁴Lovick C. Miller, "School Behavior List: An Inventory of Deviant Behavior for Elementary School Children," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 38 (February 1972): 134-144.

anxiety. Cattell and Coan's scale was developed to include traits that are transitory in nature, yet rateable and to cover those areas generally viewed as problem behavior.

Miller developed his scale by cross-validating the proposed items with the Pittsburgh Adjustment Survey Scales. The Pittsburgh Adjustment Survey Scales was developed to enable teachers to rate the emotional and social adjustment of elementary school boys between six and twelve years of age. Each of the above scales was designed to measure deviant behavior and to gather objective information on school age children.

The students ranged in age from six years and three months to ten years in Miller's study; the Pittsburgh Adjustment Survey Scales and Cattell and Coan's Scales covered an age range from six to twelve years old. How constant are behaviors across time? Miller's research concludes that behaviors are relatively constant across a time span of forty-five days when the same teacher is used as an observer. He states, however, there is no apparent reason why behavioral problems would remain constant across age; for it is believed that maturation leads to greater impulse control.¹

In a recent paper, Ehman reported that there was noticeable distortion in information reported by teachers and information reported by students on the students' freedom to express their opinions during classroom discussions.² A questionnaire was given to a group of social

¹Miller, "School Behavior List: An Inventory of Deviant Behavior for Elementary School Children," pp. 134-144.

²Lee H. Ehman, "A Comparison of Three Sources of Classroom Data: Teachers, Students, and Systematic Observation," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4 March 1974.

studies teachers. A sample of their students and systematic observers was used for this task. The teachers were asked questions during class discussions of controversial issues. Students were asked to respond to a similar questionnaire. Observers were asked to report on how they perceived the class discussions. An acceptable observation, made about the distortions in the findings of this study, is: teachers perceive this particular element of classroom phenomena differently than their students.

Discriminability as Related to Length of Behavior Checklists

The length of a behavior checklist can influence its usefulness as a data-gathering tool. It can also influence how serious the raters will consider each category as an item in relation to the ratee.

In an effort to determine the influence of length of rating scale to responses, Bendig and Hughes,¹ and Bendig² used college students enrolled in introductory and social psychology classes. For the second study, one group of students was enrolled in introductory and social psychology classes and the other group was enrolled in introductory, social, applied, and educational psychology classes. The results of the first study showed: (1) a positive relationship between information transmitted and responses; (2) they did not vary significantly in their rate of increase; and (3) the respondents demonstrated a positive relation between length of scale and stimuli used in anchoring. The

¹Albert W. Bendig, J. B. Hughes, II, "Effect of Amount of Verbal Anchoring and Number of Rating Scale Categories Upon Transmitted Information," Journal of Experimental Psychology 47 (January 1954): 87-89.

²Albert W. Bendig, "Transmitted Information and the Length of Rating Scales," Journal of Experimental Psychology 47 (January 1954): 303-308.

first study concluded that a minimum of three categories and a maximum of eleven categories should be used. One must speculate whether the deceleration in the increment of transmitted information is due to the stimulus of anchoring or the reliability of the scale.

Bendig's second study supported earlier findings on the significance of length of scale to information transmitted. Results of the second study revealed an increase in the absolute amount of transmitted information. Increased verbal anchoring of the rating scale resulted in a slight improvement in the information transmitted by the scale. Anchoring (interpreted operationally) is a statement made about each category to further explain what information is being sought and the degree of rater's knowledge about the category as it relates to ratee.¹

The wide use of rating scales in psychology and education, both as research tools and in practical application, has created a great concern about the scale itself, especially, its coarseness, length, discriminability, the effect of anchoring on the information transmitted by the raters, and interrater reliability.

Garner states that, "... the optimum number of rating categories must depend on the discriminability inherent in the particular rated stimulus, and that the optimum number of categories will be large compared to the measured information transmission."² From this study, one can infer that there is a small, but definite, increase of valid information transmitted when 20 categories are used.

¹Bendig, "Transmitted Information and the Length of Rating Scales," pp. 303-308.

²Wendel P. Garner, "Rating Scales Discriminability and Information Transmission," The Psychological Review 67 (January 1960): 343-352.

Inference can be made, from Eriksen and Hake's study, on the importance of multidimensional stimulus differences and accuracy of discrimination.¹ They found that discrimination, as measured by information transmitted, remained constant as the number of stimulus and response categories equaled or exceeded the number of response categories. Consequently, a loss in discrimination was noted when the number of response categories was fewer than the number of stimuli to be judged. Testing the speed with which objects could be located in a visual display, by compounding cues on the dimensions of hue, form, size, and brightness, did not increase the subject's rate of identifying an object. This is especially true when several cues are used to identify or locate objects that have similar and different functions. Assuming this holds true, a behavioral checklist, with several anchoring statements and categories, may prove useless, too cumbersome, and inadequate for measuring disruptive behavior.

Summary of Related Literature

The significant points derived from the literature reviewed for this study are those listed below:

1. The Pittsburgh Adjustment Survey Scales (PASS) was developed to meet the need for objective evaluation of the social behavior of elementary school age boys, using the observations of classroom teachers as the basis of measurement.
2. Other rating scales have been developed to assess such variables as low need achievement, aggression, anxiety, and transient behavioral traits.

¹Charles W. Eriksen and H. W. Hake, "Absolute Judgments as A Function of Stimulus Range and Number of Stimulus and Response Categories," Journal of Experimental Psychology 49 (August 1955): 323-332.

3. Teachers are favored as raters of student behavior because they have sufficient opportunities to observe the characteristics they are asked to judge. Classroom teachers are basically concerned with classroom management and imparting information - not psychological and sociological implications of behavior.
4. Raters' personality attributes seem to have definite effects on their behavior ratings. Some behavior ratings are not accepted because they often reflect raters' biases and the belief that ratings reflect halo effects. Well trained raters can reduce these effects. Training in specific disciplines, e.g., psychology, tends to affect raters' ratings of behavior.
5. The constancy of behavior depends upon whether the same observer does the observing. However, maturation tends to produce greater impulse control, as a result, behavioral problems may change as maturity is acquired.
6. The length of a behavior checklist can influence its usefulness in determining how seriously the rater will consider each category in relation to the ratee.
7. Rating scales are widely used as research tools in such areas as psychology and education. Care must be exercised in developing behavioral checklists so as to improve their discriminative qualities.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

The hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between teachers' ratings of pupils' behaviors in classroom settings, was tested. The subjects were 124 seventh grade boys. A seven category behavior checklist was used. Each student was rated by at least four teachers who taught him for forty-five minutes daily for one school year. The raters were asked to rate the classroom behavior of each student by placing a check mark (✓) beside one of the following judgments: almost always, often, sometimes, seldom, and never. These teacher judgments describe the behavior of each of these students in their classrooms with reference to the category and item on the behavior checklist they were considering. Horst's interjudge reliability coefficient(s) formula was used to determine the reliability of the teachers' judgments.

The information derived from the data produced by this study produced the findings listed below.

1. The coefficients of reliability for mobility for three groups of raters were .94, .95, and .96, respectively.
2. The coefficients of reliability for noise, for the three groups of judges were .94, .96, and .95, respectively.
3. The coefficients of reliability for disturbing others' property were .95, .97, and .95, respectively.

4. The coefficients of reliability for aggression toward peers were .96, .98, and .95, respectively.
5. The coefficients of reliability for aggression toward adults were .95, .97, and .95, respectively.
6. The coefficients of reliability for general verbal behavior were .97, .97, and .96, respectively.
7. The coefficients of reliability for non-verbal behavior were .96, .97, and .97, respectively.

Conclusions

The findings derived from the results of this study seem to warrant the conclusions listed below.

1. Inter-group consistency of ratings was consistent.
2. Intra-group consistency of ratings was consistent, also.
3. The hypothesis tested was: There is no statistically significant relationship between a selected group of teachers' ratings of a selected group of seventh-grade white male students. This hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level of confidence.
4. The checklist used in this study seems to be appropriate for similar kinds of usage by other teachers.
5. Disruptive classroom behaviors were assessed as being mobility, noise, disturbing others' property, mistreating adults, general verbal behavior, and non-verbal behavior.
6. These classroom teacher raters were aware of disruptive classroom behaviors exhibited by their seventh-grade white male students.

Implications

The conclusions, drawn from the findings of this study, seem to warrant the implications listed below.

1. These classroom teachers seem to be capable of agreeing upon the nature of disruptive classroom behaviors of white seventh-grade male students.

2. This behavior checklist seems to be an appropriate instrument for describing disruptive classroom behavior.
3. This behavior checklist seems to be an appropriate instrument for assessing disruptive classroom behavior.

Recommendations

The implications inherent in the conclusions drawn seem to warrant the recommendations listed below.

1. That other studies be made using this instrument.
2. That more studies be made utilizing representative samples of respondents in which more control could be exercised over such variables as sex, socio-economic levels, age, race, etc.
3. That raters reflect composition of persons whose behaviors they are rating.

TABLE 1

INTERJUDGE RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS
FOR EACH GROUP OF STUDENTS

Composition of Groups	R=4 Ss=40	R=4 Ss=47	R=5 Ss=37
I. Mobility	.94	.95	.96
II. Noise	.94	.96	.95
III. Disturbs Others' Property	.95	.97	.95
IV. Aggression-Mistreats Others (Peers)	.96	.98	.96
V. Aggression-Mistreats Others (Adults)	.95	.97	.95
VI. General Verbal Behavior	.97	.97	.96
VII. Non-Verbal Behavior	.96	.97	.97

The most salient feature of these data is the fact that consistent agreements were obtained among the raters for each category.

The results of this study indicate that teachers' ratings of students' behaviors in the classroom are reliable and consistent. This implies that the observable behaviors, described on the checklist, are stable from classroom to classroom and the teachers are rating the general classroom behavior of students. Apparently, the teachers are not focusing on specific incidents involving a student. However, a category of items that sampled reticent, unresponsive and non-involvement behavior gave low interjudge reliability coefficients in the pilot study and should be used with caution on a behavior checklist. If this is true, a carefully constructed behavior checklist can become a useful tool to the counselor.

Implications for Future Research

These results have suggested more questions to be investigated, in future research, using the behavior checklist as a means of gathering information on students' classroom behavior. Some of the questions are:

1. Should the teachers have more input into the construction of the behavior checklist?
2. Should teachers rate each student several times, at different intervals of the school year?
3. What behavior problems originate with the teacher?
4. How consistent are teacher ratings when more variables are introduced such as sex, race, grade level, and ability level of students?
5. How will the knowledge of one teacher's ratings, or an outside observer's ratings affect a second rating of the same students?
6. How will increases in the number of categories and items affect the teachers' ratings?

APPENDIX A

TABLE 2

Pilot Study - Raw Data

32 Subjects - 5 Raters

TABLE 2

*PILOT STUDY - RAW DATA
32 SUBJECTS - 5 RATERS

Group	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
*PS	1	1	11	9	6	9	8	4	10
PS	2	1	8	8	5	6	5	4	10
PS	3	1	5	6	4	5	5	4	5
PS	4	1	11	6	6	7	5	5	8
PS	5	1	5	6	5	5	6	4	7
PS	1	2	9	13	11	13	6	5	11
PS	2	2	11	8	6	5	5	4	10
PS	3	2	5	6	4	5	5	4	5
PS	4	2	7	6	6	7	5	5	8
PS	5	2	11	6	5	5	6	4	7
PS	1	3	19	13	11	16	16	10	19
PS	2	3	9	10	11	7	9	4	13
PS	3	3	8	7	6	6	9	4	7
PS	4	3	7	6	6	6	6	5	8
	5	3	12	7	11	7	7	4	6
PS	1	4	18	16	15	13	12	8	11
PS	2	4	13	9	6	7	10	5	9
PS	3	4	9	11	6	7	11	5	9
PS	4	4	7	6	5	6	5	4	7
PS	5	4	12	6	7	6	5	4	5

TABLE 2 - Continued

Group	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
PS	1	5	6	8	9	8	18	10	22
PS	2	5	14	13	5	7	13	5	12
PS	3	5	6	12	8	9	8	5	8
PS	4	5	9	6	9	9	15	4	17
PS	5	5	15	6	5	5	7	4	7
PS	1	6	11	13	7	7	5	5	6
PS	2	6	14	8	11	7	6	9	8
PS	3	6	5	6	5	5	7	4	8
PS	4	6	5	6	5	5	5	4	9
PS	5	6	5	5	5	5	7	4	6
PS	1	7	21	17	14	14	11	9	12
PS	2	7	13	13	11	8	6	9	8
PS	3	7	22	23	15	19	21	14	14
PS	4	7	9	6	10	10	5	6	7
PS	5	7	9	15	11	9	7	6	5
PS	1	8	11	11	7	10	5	7	7
PS	2	8	10	12	7	7	9	5	9
PS	3	8	9	8	7	6	12	5	12
PS	4	8	5	6	6	6	5	4	7
PS	5	8	7	6	6	5	7	4	5
PS	1	9	6	7	11	11	17	11	14
PS	2	9	12	13	6	8	13	5	14
PS	3	9	7	6	7	7	5	5	9
PS	4	9	9	6	7	8	9	4	9
PS	5	9	12	8	10	8	6	4	7

TABLE 2 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
PS	1	10	14	24	17	18	13	12	18
PS	2	10	14	9	9	9	8	5	14
PS	3	10	9	10	9	9	9	9	13
PS	4	10	9	7	7	7	5	4	8
PS	5	10	11	12	10	5	8	6	5
PS	1	11	13	8	9	9	5	10	10
PS	2	11	14	12	8	10	7	5	10
PS	3	11	17	9	8	5	8	8	9
PS	4	11	9	6	9	8	5	8	8
PS	5	11	12	6	5	7	6	4	6
PS	1	12	16	6	9	16	12	9	14
PS	2	12	14	14	7	8	11	9	10
PS	3	12	19	17	12	14	20	8	19
PS	4	12	9	6	7	9	7	7	9
PS	5	12	12	6	5	7	6	4	6
PS	1	13	10	10	12	16	16	10	18
PS	2	13	10	12	5	8	7	4	9
PS	3	13	13	9	8	9	15	8	11
PS	4	13	9	7	7	7	6	8	9
PS	5	13	11	5	5	5	6	4	5
PS	1	14	10	12	10	11	11	9	13
PS	2	14	8	15	8	10	14	5	15
PS	3	14	6	6	6	5	8	4	9
PS	4	14	6	6	5	5	6	4	10
PS	5	14	5	6	5	5	5	4	5

TABLE 2 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
PS	1	15	5	6	6	6	5	5	8
PS	2	15	8	7	5	7	5	4	9
PS	3	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PS	4	15	9	6	6	7	5	6	8
PS	5	15	9	6	5	7	5	4	5
PS	1	16	10	7	11	11	12	10	13
PS	2	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PS	3	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PS	4	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PS	5	16	8	6	5	5	6	4	6
PS	1	17	7	7	9	15	16	9	13
PS	2	17	10	12	7	9	13	9	14
PS	3	17	9	8	8	9	14	5	12
PS	4	17	7	6	7	7	7	4	10
PS	5	17	11	6	6	5	14	3	12
PS	1	18	18	19	13	16	17	14	17
PS	2	18	11	14	5	7	12	4	11
PS	3	18	13	14	9	11	19	11	15
PS	4	18	10	7	5	6	7	6	6
PS	5	18	15	8	5	5	9	7	10
PS	1	19	5	8	6	10	15	5	17
PS	2	19	9	9	11	7	6	6	9
PS	3	19	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
PS	4	19	7	6	7	8	6	4	7
PS	5	19	5	6	5	5	5	4	5

TABLE 2 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
PS	1	20	23	26	17	22	21	16	20
PS	2	20	14	18	14	14	19	11	16
PS	3	20	11	7	12	10	19	7	14
PS	4	20	11	7	6	12	11	10	13
PS	5	20	11	8	8	8	5	5	9
PS	1	21	17	15	11	19	11	12	13
PS	2	21	9	11	8	9	15	7	11
PS	3	21	13	10	8	9	15	9	14
PS	4	21	9	6	7	10	9	6	9
PS	5	21	9	7	7	8	7	6	7
PS	1	22	22	32	13	20	14	12	13
PS	2	22	11	13	10	9	9	4	8
PS	3	22	11	14	13	11	15	13	12
PS	4	22	13	6	9	12	9	8	8
PS	5	22	16	7	11	8	5	7	8
PS	1	23	8	6	9	9	14	8	14
PS	2	23	8	8	8	8	12	5	11
PS	3	23	11	13	6	9	19	10	16
PS	4	23	7	7	6	6	5	5	9
PS	5	23	11	6	12	8	7	6	12

TABLE 2 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
PS	1	24	7	8	12	15	20	13	18
PS	2	24	14	16	11	13	15	8	12
PS	3	24	16	11	14	11	17	16	14
PS	4	24	13	9	9	11	6	10	10
PS	5	24	18	13	13	9	9	10	14
PS	1	25	10	10	13	13	8	8	12
PS	2	25	14	13	12	11	8	7	7
PS	3	25	20	13	16	13	16	13	14
PS	4	25	9	7	9	11	5	6	9
PS	5	25	8	5	12	7	7	7	10
PS	1	26	9	8	11	8	8	7	12
PS	2	26	7	10	5	6	8	4	10
PS	3	26	12	8	8	8	10	8	10
PS	4	26	5	6	5	6	5	4	11
PS	5	26	8	6	11	7	5	6	6
PS	1	27	8	8	11	9	15	7	15
PS	2	27	12	10	17	7	8	5	10
PS	3	27	17	9	8	8	13	11	10
PS	4	27	7	6	9	8	5	6	10
PS	5	27	8	6	9	8	6	8	5

TABLE 2 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
PS	1	28	9	7	11	8	11	7	12
PS	2	28	16	12	5	9	13	5	12
PS	3	28	16	5	6	5	5	10	8
PS	4	28	14	6	7	7	12	8	10
PS	5	28	11	6	5	7	9	7	9
PS	1	29	11	12	16	12	18	11	14
PS	2	29	8	7	5	6	10	4	11
PS	3	29	11	7	6	5	5	6	7
PS	4	29	8	6	5	6	5	5	7
PS	5	29	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
PS	1	30	19	13	14	13	17	11	17
PS	2	30	12	7	7	7	7	5	10
PS	3	30	20	11	15	11	16	12	13
PS	4	30	12	6	9	10	7	6	8
PS	5	30	16	6	8	7	10	8	9
PS	1	31	16	12	16	14	17	16	20
PS	2	31	11	12	9	13	18	5	15
PS	3	31	17	11	13	12	19	13	10
PS	4	31	11	6	9	10	11	6	10
PS	5	31	13	6	13	10	8	9	10
PS	1	32	14	16	18	19	11	9	16
PS	2	32	10	10	11	9	8	4	9
PS	3	32	16	9	14	13	16	12	11
PS	4	32	11	6	9	10	8	6	9
PS	5	32	8	8	10	7	5	6	6

APPENDIX B

TABLE 3

Group I - Raw Data

40 Subjects - 4 Raters

TABLE 3
GROUP I - RAW DATA
40 SUBJECTS - 4 RATERS

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	1	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
1	2	1	5	13	10	7	11	7	12
1	3	1	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	1	5	6	7	5	5	4	5
1	1	2	5	6	5	6	5	4	7
1	2	2	5	11	5	5	5	4	8
1	3	2	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
1	4	2	5	7	5	5	5	4	7
1	1	3	8	6	6	5	6	4	6
1	2	3	10	13	11	9	5	7	8
1	3	3	11	6	5	5	5	6	5
1	4	3	10	7	5	5	5	7	7
1	1	4	6	6	5	6	5	4	10
1	2	4	7	11	8	9	5	6	8
1	3	4	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	4	5	6	5	5	5	4	5

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	5	9	6	5	11	9	8	7
1	2	5	13	17	10	5	7	6	7
1	3	5	10	6	5	5	5	5	5
1	4	5	10	6	5	5	5	6	7
1	1	6	6	6	10	9	5	5	9
1	2	6	9	6	5	5	5	5	7
1	3	6	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	6	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	7	6	6	9	9	7	5	11
1	2	7	6	6	9	9	7	5	11
1	3	7	6	6	5	5	5	4	6
1	4	7	5	6	6	5	5	4	5
1	1	8	9	9	8	8	8	7	2
1	2	8	9	6	8	5	7	7	10
1	3	8	6	6	6	5	5	4	5
1	4	8	6	6	6	5	5	4	5
1	1	9	7	6	5	5	6	5	7
1	2	9	7	8	5	5	5	5	6
1	3	9	7	6	5	5	3	4	5
1	4	9	7	6	5	5	3	4	5

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	10	8	7	5	5	5	4	6
1	2	10	13	10	5	5	5	4	9
1	3	10	5	6	5	5	5	4	6
1	4	10	5	6	5	5	5	4	6
1	1	11	6	7	8	7	9	7	5
1	2	11	6	9	6	5	5	5	8
1	3	11	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	11	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	12	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	2	12	8	13	10	5	7	7	8
1	3	12	5	6	5	5	5	5	5
1	4	12	5	6	5	5	5	5	5
1	1	13	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	2	13	14	14	11	9	8	8	9
1	3	13	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	13	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	14	8	6	5	8	7	5	9
1	2	14	9	8	5	8	7	5	9
1	3	14	13	13	11	11	7	8	10
1	4	14	8	6	5	5	5	6	5

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	15	5	6	5	5	5	5	6
1	2	15	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	3	15	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	15	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	16	7	6	5	5	5	5	7
1	2	16	8	9	8	6	5	5	6
1	3	16	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	16	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	17	7	6	5	7	5	5	6
1	2	17	8	9	8	5	5	6	6
1	3	17	5	6	5	5	5	4	4
1	4	17	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	18	10	9	8	7	11	9	7
1	2	18	11	14	11	11	9	8	12
1	3	18	7	7	6	5	6	6	5
1	4	18	7	7	6	5	6	6	5
1	1	19	5	6	5	5	7	5	9
1	2	19	10	11	9	12	9	7	13
1	3	19	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	19	5	6	5	5	5	4	5

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others: Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	20	7	9	7	9	5	6	8
1	2	20	8	11	8	6	5	7	5
1	3	20	7	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	20	7	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	21	9	8	5	7	9	4	9
1	2	21	8	13	7	7	9	6	12
1	3	21	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	21	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	1	22	11	12	10	13	5	9	7
1	2	22	17	14	11	9	10	9	10
1	3	22	11	7	9	5	5	8	5
1	4	22	11	7	9	5	5	8	5
1	1	23	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	2	23	6	9	5	5	5	7	4
1	3	23	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	23	5	6	7	5	7	4	7
1	1	24	5	6	5	5	5	4	8
1	2	24	9	9	9	5	5	5	7
1	3	24	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	24	5	9	9	5	5	4	5

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	25	5	8	5	5	7	5	7
1	2	25	13	8	9	6	5	6	7
1	3	25	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	25	5	8	9	5	5	6	7
1	1	26	8	8	7	10	13	8	7
1	2	26	15	14	11	7	10	8	10
1	3	26	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	26	8	5	7	10	13	8	7
1	1	27	10	13	8	10	12	7	8
1	2	27	14	16	11	7	7	7	7
1	3	27	13	6	8	8	5	7	5
1	4	27	14	16	8	7	12	7	8
1	1	28	7	9	7	7	10	6	8
1	2	28	13	15	11	7	5	7	10
1	3	28	8	6	5	5	5	6	5
1	4	28	8	6	11	7	5	7	10
1	1	29	12	6	7	7	11	7	9
1	2	29	16	16	11	12	9	9	10
1	3	29	7	6	5	5	5	5	5
1	4	29	15	14	12	7	11	8	9

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	30	10	13	8	8	20	10	15
1	2	30	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	3	30	6	6	5	5	5	4	6
1	4	30	10	12	5	5	18	6	14
1	1	31	16	10	9	14	16	12	16
1	2	31	23	23	17	12	19	16	12
1	3	31	10	6	5	5	5	8	7
1	4	31	18	13	11	12	12	9	14
1	1	32	13	11	8	9	10	6	8
1	2	32	11	11	9	9	7	7	9
1	3	32	8	6	5	5	5	7	5
1	4	32	19	24	18	9	18	12	9
1	1	33	10	10	8	9	11	7	12
1	2	33	10	14	8	7	8	6	9
1	3	33	8	6	5	5	5	7	5
1	4	33	17	14	11	8	8	9	9

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	34	12	11	8	10	13	11	13
1	2	34	16	16	11	12	14	10	13
1	3	34	8	6	5	5	5	7	5
1	4	34	22	17	14	9	8	8	10
1	1	35	7	7	5	5	5	4	7
1	2	35	10	6	5	5	5	4	6
1	3	35	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	35	12	11	11	11	9	9	7
1	1	36	7	10	5	6	8	6	6
1	2	36	12	14	10	13	10	8	10
1	3	36	9	6	5	5	5	6	5
1	4	36	15	13	10	11	11	13	5
1	1	37	10	9	8	12	16	7	13
1	2	37	14	15	12	13	11	10	12
1	3	37	7	6	5	5	7	7	8
1	4	37	25	30	25	25	25	20	25

TABLE 3 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others/ Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
1	1	38	10	13	9	9	10	9	8
1	2	38	13	15	11	10	13	10	11
1	3	38	5	6	5	5	5	6	5
1	4	38	15	16	12	10	10	8	10
1	1	39	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	2	39	11	13	9	7	8	7	9
1	3	39	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
1	4	39	12	13	11	10	10	8	11
1	1	40	13	11	6	7	10	8	11
1	2	40	12	15	10	6	5	7	6
1	3	40	7	6	5	5	5	5	5
1	4	40	10	14	10	6	10	8	11

APPENDIX C

TABLE 4

Group II - Raw Data

47 Subjects - 4 Raters

TABLE 4
GROUP II - RAW DATA
47 SUBJECTS - 4 RATERS

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	1	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	1	8	9	5	6	5	5	5
2	3	1	5	6	5	5	5	4	6
2	4	1	5	6	5	6	5	5	5
2	1	2	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	2	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
2	3	2	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
2	4	2	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
2	1	3	6	7	5	5	5	5	5
2	2	3	14	10	5	6	5	8	6
2	3	3	5	6	5	6	5	6	5
2	4	3	5	6	5	6	5	7	6
2	1	4	5	7	6	6	6	9	6
2	2	4	6	12	8	7	8	8	8
2	3	4	5	9	5	6	6	7	5
2	4	4	6	12	8	7	8	8	8

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	5	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	5	5	9	5	6	5	5	5
2	3	5	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
2	4	5	5	9	5	6	5	5	5
2	1	6	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	6	8	8	5	6	5	5	5
2	3	6	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
2	4	6	8	5	6	5	5	5	
2	1	7	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	7	8	9	5	7	10	7	8
2	3	7	5	7	6	6	7	5	6
2	4	7	8	9	5	7	10	7	8
2	1	8	5	6	5	5	6	5	5
2	2	8	8	8	5	5	6	5	10
2	3	8	5	8	5	5	5	4	7
2	4	8	5	8	5	5	6	5	10
2	1	9	5	8	5	5	6	7	5
2	2	9	12	10	6	6	9	7	9
2	3	9	8	7	5	6	5	6	7
2	4	9	12	8	5	5	6	7	5

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General - Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	10	6	7	8	6	5	5	5
2	2	10	12	8	7	6	5	7	7
2	3	10	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	4	10	5	12	7	6	5	7	7
2	1	11	5	7	7	5	5	4	5
2	2	11	8	9	6	5	5	6	5
2	3	11	5	6	5	6	5	6	5
2	4	11	8	9	6	6	6	6	7
2	1	12	6	7	6	6	9	4	5
2	2	12	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
2	3	12	9	8	5	7	8	8	7
2	4	12	9	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	1	13	6	7	6	9	9	7	6
2	2	13	11	8	8	10	14	8	13
2	3	13	12	7	10	9	15	12	10
2	4	13	12	8	9	9	13	12	10
2	1	14	7	8	5	5	5	5	5
2	2	14	9	9	8	7	7	6	7
2	3	14	5	6	5	7	5	6	6
2	4	14	6	6	8	9	7	6	5

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	15	12	21	6	8	7	8	7
2	2	15	15	13	8	7	9	7	8
2	3	15	18	15	9	7	7	7	7
2	4	15	16	18	9	8	7	7	8
2	1	16	6	5	5	6	7	6	6
2	2	16	12	13	8	8	12	7	9
2	3	16	5	7	8	7	5	6	5
2	4	16	13	12	13	8	10	9	6
2	1	17	5	7	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	17	10	9	6	6	8	7	7
2	3	17	10	9	9	7	8	8	7
2	4	17	10	8	9	7	6	7	7
2	1	18	5	6	5	7	5	4	5
2	2	18	7	9	5	7	5	6	6
2	3	18	5	6	5	5	5	5	6
2	4	18	5	6	5	6	7	5	8
2	1	19	5	7	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	19	11	9	6	6	5	7	7
2	3	19	5	8	5	6	5	5	5
2	4	19	11	9	6	6	5	7	7

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	20	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	20	8	6	5	6	5	4	6
2	3	20	5	6	5	5	5	4	8
2	4	20	8	6	5	6	5	4	6
2	1	21	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	21	8	7	5	6	5	5	5
2	3	21	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
2	4	21	8	7	5	6	5	5	5
2	1	22	5	6	5	6	7	8	6
2	2	22	13	9	6	7	7	7	8
2	3	22	7	9	5	6	7	5	6
2	4	22	12	8	9	5	4	5	8
2	1	23	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	23	11	9	7	6	8	6	7
2	3	23	6	6	5	7	6	6	7
2	4	23	11	9	5	5	6	6	7
2	1	24	12	8	5	5	5	5	5
2	2	24	11	9	7	6	8	6	7
2	3	24	14	8	6	9	6	9	6
2	4	24	14	9	7	9	6	9	6

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	25	6	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	25	23	23	11	9	12	8	11
2	3	25	10	9	5	6	5	6	6
2	4	25	13	12	11	9	12	8	6
2	1	26	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	26	17	16	8	7	5	8	7
2	3	26	5	6	6	6	5	4	6
2	4	26	5	6	6	6	5	4	6
2	1	27	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	27	12	9	6	7	5	6	8
2	3	27	5	7	6	7	5	8	5
2	4	27	5	7	6	7	5	6	8
2	1	28	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
2	2	28	12	9	7	7	5	5	6
2	3	28	5	7	6	5	5	4	5
2	4	28	5	9	7	7	5	5	6
2	1	29	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	29	11	9	9	7	10	6	6
2	3	29	7	8	6	6	5	6	5
2	4	29	7	8	6	7	10	6	6

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	30	5	8	8	5	5	5	5
2	2	30	16	14	7	7	8	7	7
2	3	30	5	7	6	6	5	6	6
2	4	30	14	16	7	7	8	6	7
2	1	31	5	6	5	5	6	4	7
2	2	31	13	15	7	8	7	7	6
2	3	31	5	7	5	6	8	5	5
2	4	31	13	15	8	6	8	5	5
2	1	32	8	11	5	7	7	6	5
2	2	32	5	10	5	8	7	6	11
2	3	32	14	8	8	8	10	8	6
2	4	32	14	10	5	8	7	6	11
2	1	33	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	33	19	17	15	9	12	10	11
2	3	33	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
2	4	33	19	17	15	9	12	10	11
2	1	34	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
2	2	34	8	9	5	7	5	4	5
2	3	34	5	6	5	6	5	5	5
2	4	34	5	6	7	6	5	4	5

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	35	5	7	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	35	8	9	5	7	5	4	4
2	3	35	5	8	5	6	5	7	5
2	4	35	8	9	5	7	5	4	5
2	1	36	13	7	5	9	9	9	9
2	2	36	13	11	6	9	10	6	10
2	3	36	11	14	5	12	15	13	7
2	4	36	11	14	6	9	10	13	7
2	1	37	5	7	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	37	4	21	19	16	21	15	18
2	3	37	5	6	5	6	5	5	5
2	4	37	5	6	5	16	20	14	18
2	1	38	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	38	8	8	8	7	7	5	7
2	3	38	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	4	38	8	8	8	5	5	7	7
2	1	39	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
2	2	39	8	8	5	5	5	4	6
2	3	39	5	7	5	7	5	6	5
2	4	39	5	7	7	7	8	8	5

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	40	6	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	40	22	21	14	14	18	13	10
2	3	40	10	9	7	6	9	6	10
2	4	40	10	20	14	6	18	13	10
2	1	41	6	6	5	5	5	4	5
2	2	41	8	13	6	7	7	6	8
2	3	41	5	6	5	5	5	4	8
2	4	41	8	13	6	7	7	6	8
2	1	42	7	8	5	5	5	6	6
2	2	42	13	14	7	9	5	9	10
2	3	42	7	6	5	6	5	5	5
2	4	42	13	14	7	8	5	9	10
2	1	43	5	6	5	5	7	4	6
2	1	43	8	9	5	7	7	5	6
2	1	43	12	9	7	8	12	9	12
2	1	43	8	9	5	7	7	5	6

TABLE 4 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
2	1	44	5	6	5	5	7	4	5
2	2	44	13	17	12	12	10	8	10
2	3	44	9	9	6	5	5	4	5
2	4	44	9	9	6	5	10	8	10
2	1	45	5	8	8	6	7	5	5
2	2	45	10	13	10	10	13	6	15
2	3	45	11	12	12	10	13	11	12
2	4	45	10	13	10	10	13	11	12
2	1	46	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
2	2	46	13	17	10	14	11	10	12
2	3	46	5	6	5	5	5	4	7
2	4	46	5	13	10	14	11	13	13
2	1	47	6	8	5	5	5	5	5
2	2	47	10	11	8	7	5	6	9
2	3	47	11	8	9	8	6	7	5
2	4	47	10	11	8	8	5	7	9

APPENDIX D

TABLE 5

Group III - Raw Data

37 Subjects - 5 Raters

TABLE 5

GROUP III - RAW DATA
37 SUBJECTS - 5 RATERS

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	1	5	6	5	5	7	4	11
3	2	1	5	6	5	5	5	4	10
3	3	1	5	6	7	5	5	5	9
3	4	1	9	9	6	9	15	8	15
3	5	1	11	12	8	11	11	8	11
3	1	2	7	6	5	5	6	5	10
3	2	2	16	15	7	7	7	5	9
3	3	2	12	17	16	8	8	7	10
3	4	2	16	17	11	13	18	12	15
3	5	2	18	17	14	16	17	11	14
3	1	3	5	6	5	6	6	5	7
3	2	3	5	6	5	6	6	4	7
3	3	3	9	6	5	5	5	5	5
3	4	3	14	14	11	11	14	9	11
3	5	3	11	15	13	11	11	8	12
3	1	4	5	6	5	6	5	5	8
3	2	4	5	7	5	6	5	4	5
3	3	4	7	6	5	5	5	5	5
3	4	4	9	7	5	5	5	4	6
3	5	4	9	10	9	7	5	9	8

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	5	5	6	5	6	5	6	7
3	2	5	6	6	5	6	5	4	5
3	3	5	5	6	5	6	5	4	5
3	4	5	7	9	9	11	12	5	8
3	5	5	11	9	13	11	11	9	11
3	1	6	7	6	5	6	5	9	7
3	2	6	20	9	10	10	8	8	5
3	3	6	9	6	8	7	4	8	7
3	4	6	17	14	12	5	8	10	11
3	5	6	8	12	12	11	7	6	11
3	1	7	5	6	5	6	5	4	9
3	2	7	9	6	5	7	7	5	6
3	3	7	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	4	7	14	9	8	11	18	5	16
3	5	7	18	14	20	17	11	14	16
3	1	8	9	6	5	9	9	7	9
3	2	8	9	6	10	9	9	9	6
3	3	8	10	7	8	5	8	6	8
3	4	8	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	5	8	19	22	19	18	12	17	17

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggressive- Mistreats Others	Aggressive- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	9	5	6	5	5	5	5	7
3	2	9	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	3	9	5	6	5	5	5	4	8
3	4	9	17	11	9	11	20	13	19
3	5	9	10	14	14	13	10	9	11
3	1	10	9	6	6	7	9	8	8
3	2	10	19	21	15	11	13	10	8
3	3	10	14	10	10	5	10	7	10
3	4	10	6	6	5	5	6	4	8
3	5	10	7	6	5	5	5	4	10
3	1	11	7	6	5	7	7	9	8
3	2	11	6	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	3	11	7	6	8	5	5	6	6
3	4	11	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	5	11	13	15	11	13	12	8	13
3	1	12	7	6	5	6	8	5	7
3	2	12	9	7	5	7	5	6	5
3	3	12	8	6	6	5	9	5	7
3	4	12	9	9	10	7	9	6	10
3	5	12	18	18	9	13	8	10	10

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	13	5	6	5	6	5	6	7
3	2	13	7	6	5	5	8	5	8
3	3	13	5	6	5	5	7	4	10
3	4	13	17	11	9	7	11	9	11
3	5	13	20	17	12	14	11	9	14
3	1	14	7	6	5	6	11	5	11
3	2	14	9	10	10	9	10	7	8
3	3	14	12	8	9	5	13	4	12
3	4	14	9	8	7	7	12	5	10
3	5	14	9	12	5	9	13	7	17
3	1	15	5	6	5	5	5	4	13
3	2	15	9	8	5	5	5	6	10
3	3	15	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	4	15	19	17	15	13	19	16	18
3	5	15	19	20	20	22	19	15	18
3	1	16	7	6	5	6	5	4	7
3	2	16	9	6	5	8	5	4	5
3	3	16	6	6	8	5	5	6	5
3	4	16	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	5	16	5	9	9	7	6	5	18

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others ¹ Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	17	6	6	5	5	5	4	7
3	2	17	7	8	7	5	6	4	5
3	3	17	7	6	5	6	5	5	5
3	4	17	10	7	8	7	8	6	11
3	5	17	14	18	9	5	7	5	7
3	1	18	5	6	5	5	5	4	6
3	2	18	7	6	5	7	6	5	5
3	3	18	5	6	5	6	5	5	5
3	4	18	7	6	5	5	13	9	13
3	5	18	9	12	10	8	6	7	9
3	1	19	5	6	5	6	5	5	7
3	2	19	10	12	15	9	7	5	5
3	3	19	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	4	19	10	5	5	9	7	6	10
3	5	19	9	12	11	12	6	8	12
3	1	20	5	6	5	5	6	4	11
3	2	20	5	6	5	6	5	5	7
3	3	20	5	8	5	5	7	6	7
3	4	20	10	8	10	9	10	9	10
3	5	20	12	12	11	12	12	7	12

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	21	7	6	5	6	7	5	7
3	2	21	12	8	7	7	5	6	5
3	3	21	9	9	7	5	5	6	6
3	4	21	8	8	6	7	13	7	14
3	5	21	5	8	12	14	10	5	11
3	1	22	12	7	5	11	12	9	9
3	2	22	11	12	15	12	9	10	5
3	3	22	15	17	15	9	5	4	12
3	4	22	13	10	12	10	15	10	15
3	5	22	16	24	16	11	11	10	12
3	1	23	11	6	5	0	7	8	8
3	2	23	13	14	14	13	11	9	8
3	3	23	20	26	12	10	8	10	11
3	4	23	16	15	13	10	16	8	15
3	5	23	24	21	22	17	15	17	18
3	1	24	7	6	5	6	6	5	8
3	2	24	23	17	14	14	11	11	7
3	3	24	15	8	8	7	7	6	8
3	4	24	18	14	12	10	14	11	13
3	5	24	20	25	19	22	22	17	19

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	25	7	6	5	6	5	5	7
3	2	25	8	9	10	9	8	8	5
3	3	25	8	8	8	6	5	5	8
3	4	25	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	5	25	11	16	17	15	12	11	14
3	1	26	5	6	5	5	5	4	8
3	2	26	7	5	5	5	5	4	5
3	3	26	7	8	7	6	7	6	5
3	4	26	18	13	11	11	11	10	12
3	5	26	10	12	10	7	9	6	11
3	1	27	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	2	27	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	3	27	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	4	27	10	10	8	6	5	7	7
3	5	27	5	6	8	5	5	5	6
3	1	28	9	6	5	7	6	7	10
3	2	28	11	8	13	7	5	8	5
3	3	28	6	6	5	6	6	5	5
3	4	28	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	5	28	15	17	15	15	10	11	16

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	29	7	6	5	7	16	9	16
3	2	29	11	6	5	7	7	5	5
3	3	29	16	7	5	5	12	4	17
3	4	29	5	6	5	5	5	4	5
3	5	29	16	14	14	10	12	7	9
3	1	30	7	6	5	8	7	4	10
3	2	30	11	10	15	11	9	7	5
3	3	30	15	8	6	5	9	6	11
3	4	30	12	9	11	9	7	9	10
3	5	30	13	14	12	14	11	10	12
3	1	31	14	8	5	6	7	6	17
3	2	31	21	11	13	13	16	7	19
3	3	31	18	7	5	7	11	5	18
3	4	31	14	14	9	10	18	11	18
3	5	31	12	13	12	8	21	12	20
3	1	32	9	6	5	9	10	8	11
3	2	32	11	14	11	11	14	9	5
3	3	32	18	9	8	9	12	8	16
3	4	32	13	13	10	10	15	10	14
3	5	32	10	10	10	14	18	16	14

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	33	9	6	5	6	5	8	11
3	2	33	10	12	12	10	10	11	10
3	3	33	12	9	8	8	7	9	8
3	4	33	17	16	13	12	18	10	16
3	5	33	21	15	19	15	12	10	14
3	1	34	7	6	5	7	5	5	7
3	2	34	16	13	15	12	13	9	14
3	3	34	10	6	5	6	9	4	12
3	4	34	22	12	11	13	20	8	18
3	5	34	16	15	15	21	20	15	20
3	1	35	5	6	5	6	5	5	7
3	2	35	7	7	5	8	7	5	7
3	3	35	7	6	5	5	7	5	10
3	4	35	20	15	11	13	20	12	19
3	5	35	16	17	17	17	18	17	23
3	1	36	9	6	5	9	5	8	7
3	2	36	13	6	8	10	14	11	9
3	3	36	11	6	5	6	7	8	10
3	4	36	17	12	11	10	10	10	10
3	5	36	17	14	14	19	11	11	12

TABLE 5 - Continued

Groups	Raters	Subjects	Mobility	Noise	Disturbs Others' Property	Aggression- Mistreats Others	Aggression- Mistreats Adults	General-Verbal Behavior	Non-Verbal Behavior
3	1	37	11	9	5	10	11	7	12
3	2	37	16	20	20	18	20	14	16
3	3	37	17	10	5	8	9	7	13
3	4	37	13	11	11	11	9	10	16
3	5	37	7	15	15	16	21	14	17

APPENDIX E

BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST

BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST

RATEE's NAME: _____

DATE: _____

RATER's NAME: _____

Check Only One For Each

	<u>Almost Always</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Some- times</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Never</u>
I. <u>Mobility</u>					
1. Gets out of seat	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Stands near seat	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Runs, hops, dances about	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Walks around	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Moves furniture	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
II. <u>Noise</u>					
1. Taps pencil or other objects	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Claps hand	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Taps feet	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Rattles or tears paper	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Throws objects to make noise	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Slams furniture	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
III. <u>Disturbs Others' Property</u>					
1. Grabs objects or work of other students	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Knocks neighbor's supplies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Destroys another's property	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Steals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Hides objects of work of other students	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
IV. <u>Aggression-Mistreat Others</u>					
1. Hits, kicks, slaps, shoves	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Pulls hair	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Calls names	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Strikes with objects	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Curses and/or uses other forms of verbal abuse	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
V. <u>Aggression-Mistreat Adults</u>					
1. Talks back	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Refuses to follow directions	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Refuses to do work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Curses and/or uses other forms of verbal abuse	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Turns away when spoken to	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
VI. <u>General Verbal Behavior</u>					
1. Curses	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Lies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Teases	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Talks incessantly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
VII. <u>Non-Verbal Behavior</u>					
1. Refuses to respond to commands	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Seems withdrawn	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Attends to others' task	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Ignores questions asked of him	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Does different than directed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTALS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Long, Nicholas J., Morse, William C., and Newman, Ruth G., eds.
Conflict in the Classroom. Belmont, California: Wadsworth
Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- Peters, Herman J., and Farwell, Gail F. Guidance: A Developmental
Approach. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

Journals

- Bendig, Albert W. "Transmitted Information and the Length of Rating
Scales." Journal of Experimental Psychology 47 (January 1954):
303-308.
- Bendig, Albert W., and Hughes, J.B., II. "Effect of Amount of Verbal
Anchoring and Number of Rating Scale Categories Upon Transmitted
Information." Journal of Experimental Psychology 47 (January 1954):
87-89.
- Cattell, Raymond B., and Coan, Richard W. "Child Personality Structure
as Revealed in Teachers' Behavior Ratings." Journal of Clinical
Psychology 13 (May 1959): 315-27.
- Digman, John M. "Child Behavior Ratings: Further Evidence of A Multiple-
Factor Model of Child Personality." Educational and Psychological
Measurement 25 (August 1965): 787-99.
- Eriksen, Charles W., and Hake, H.W. "Absolute Judgments as A Function
of Stimulus Range and Number of Stimulus and Response Categories." Journal of Experimental Psychology 49 (August 1955): 323-32.
- Feshbach, Norma D. "Student Teacher Preference for Elementary School
Pupils Varying in Personality Characteristics." Journal of Educa-
tional Psychology 60 (April 1969): 126-39.
- Garner, Wendell R. "Rating Scales Discriminability and Information Trans-
mission." The Psychological Review 67 (August 1955): 323-32.
- Horst, Paul. "A Generalized Expression for the Reliability of Measures." Psychometrika 14 (1949): 21-31. (Cited Rowe 1970 Dissertation,
"Humanistic Dimensions in Academic Achievement.")
- Miller, Lovick C. "School Behavior List: An Inventory of Deviant Behav-
ior for Elementary School Children." Journal of Counseling and
Clinical Psychology 38 (February 1972): 134-44.
- Quay, Herbert C. and Quay, Lorence C. "Behavior Problems in Early Adoles-
cence." Child Development 36 (March 1965): 215-20.

Journals-(Continued)

Ross, Alan O., Lacey, Harvey M., and Parton, David A. "The Development of a Behavior Checklist for Boys." Child Development 35 (May-August 1959): 1013-27.

Tolar, Alexander, Scarpetti, William L., and Lane, Paul A. "Teachers' Attitudes Toward Children's Behavior Revisited." Journal of Educational Psychology 58 (June 1968): 175-80.

Theses and Other Papers

Ehman, Lee H. "A Comparison of Three Sources of Classroom Data: Teachers, Students, and Systematic Observations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 4 March 1974.